

Local Homeless Coordinating Board

Full Board June 3, 2019 Minutes

Sophia Isom: I just have one minor correction for us on page three, where it's indicating I supported it. It should read, "I support."

Del Seymour: So all those that are in favor of passing these minutes and putting them in the records, say, "Yes."

Del Seymour: All those who oppose say, "No." Anybody abstain? If so it passes and we will put it into the record. This for information only, we will have this meeting go to 1:30 today if we do need the time. We have some issues on here we want to make sure we address everything.

Minutes Approved

Del Seymour: So our first agenda item will be Board announcements.

Kelley Cutler: I'm just wondering when we're going to be having the board retreat or when to schedule that?

Del Seymour: So should we put that on the agenda to talk about it in July so we can do some planning or?

Kelley Cutler: It's been going on for a while now. So yeah, I think that would be a great idea.

Brenda Jewett: I was just going to say I'd like some more information on navigation centers, who is communicating with residents. What's in the process now? How our decision making being made? I had a lot of questions and I would love to have some more information about the decision making around that.

Jeff Kositsky: I can do that. Yeah. Somebody from our staff.

Del Seymour: So an item that we want to be considered to be put on the July agenda will be our discussion and possible action or idea of a homeless commission.

Jeff Kositsky: We could also invite Emily Cohen who's the mayor's policy advisor on this.

Ralph Payton: I mean, without is knowing her position that will be hard?

Jeff Kositsky: Well, I think we'll know by July--

Del Seymour: So meetings regarding this in the meantime will be on the 24th, is that correct?

Jeff Kositsky: I think so but I'm hearing maybe not until July 8th.

Del Seymour: Because originally this might be presented to the full board on the second?

Jeff Kositsky: It's possible that it would be on the 2nd but it's likely it's going to be later than that, yeah. So the earliest it could be heard by the roles committee based on board of supervisors roles would be June

24th. But the last that I heard from somebody in the City Attorney's Office they are expecting it to be on by July 8th and then the board can vote on it on the 9th. Technically, they don't need to have it. I think they have till very early August to actually put it on the ballot. So probably it's going to be in July also given the budget process happening in June so my guess is that it will be July and August when this gets decided.

Del Seymour: there will be some meetings this month in city hall regarding this and the local board will be invited to these meetings.

Andrea Evans: Would it be possible to get a copy of the city attorney's analysis of the commission and how it comports with this one?

Jeff Kositsky: So we would have to ask, and I'd be happy, or Charles can ask on your behalf to get an analysis from the city attorney, information that we-- any correspondence that we have with the city attorney or any other department heads is confidential. As an attorney client, it falls under attorney-client privilege, but I can request that Ann Pearson write a letter specifically to the local board and, just to clarify your question.

Andrea Evans: It's my understanding that the part of the reason that Superior Haney wants a separate commission is that it would not be legally possible to have a commission fall under this board or somehow be related to this board, and so I would just like to understand what the legal analysis is behind that. And then also, I wanted to know kind of what the lines of demarcation between the authority of the a commission and our LHCB and how that would play out.

Jeff Kositsky: So, specifically, around the relationship and potential conflict between this board and a potential commission as the legislation is currently written. Is that right? Okay.

Ralph Payton: If this board can even play a role in that and I think that's what you're alluding to, the legal obstacles that I see being, or becoming, that commission. So it would be great if we could sort of get an, because that's what you were alluding to with that analysis and get information on if there are legal obstacles, and what those obstacles are?

Del Seymour: So from my standpoint, I've been like, "Whoop." I've been spearheading this all week. We want to look at a model that's going to be multijurisdictional. This proposed commission should be we have governors over HSOC, Department of Emergency Management, DPW, and SFPD because if we just made this one department jurisdiction, we're going to be exactly where are right now. Everyone else is saying, "Well, I don't report to you guys. So I'm not going to your meeting. So until we get to that level it is bogus.

Jeff Kositsky: Yeah. I just want to check in quickly with Charles and anybody else on HSH staff that here regarding upcoming NOFA or other issues that-- we now have a pretty packed agenda for July.

Charles Minor: Right. Traditionally, the NOFA is due to be released right now. So we're really looking at a tight timeframe in terms of that our agenda. Be prepared that if the NOFA was actually to be released in the next three four weeks that would definitely take precedent over kind of anything else that we had on the agenda. The also possible topic that we had slated was a deeper dive on the PIT.

Jeff Kositsky: We will be issuing the full report probably that day. We can provide you a full report as well as we would like to give you an update on the budget at that time as well. So those are a lot of agenda items, so you all might want to take a few minutes to prioritize what you would like us to cover during those meetings. The NOFA, it will likely be released. It's been delayed due to conflicts at HUD over some policy issues that I think are going to shake out well from what I hear. But we do need to make sure that that's front and center, and then there's budget and the PIT count navigation centers and the commission.

Del Seymour: Okay. The closer we get to that July date, when we see what actual items are on the agenda then we can make discussions around prioritizing those.

Jeff Kositsky: Okay. Can I just ask how we would do that, just given it should be done-- setting the agenda should really be done in the light of day, so to speak. And I also wanted to recommend, if it's possible, Charles, that we-- I know that there's a 1:30 standing meeting behind us. I don't know if it's possible that we could start this meeting a half hour earlier so that we've got more time. I don't know if you all are interested in that, but it feels like we're constantly bumping up against this time constraint with the meeting behind us.

Charles Minor: I'll move it to the board for consideration. Just logistically, that's something I want to check in terms of being able to schedule. Traditionally, it's not difficult for me to get in here to get it set up 30 minutes earlier. It's just a matter if we can still have kind of that 15 to 30 minute window for me to set up beforehand.

Ralph Payton: Honestly, I'm fine with keeping the time the same. I know every once in a while we do run over but it's more the exception than the rule. And having this meeting at 11:00 for how many years now?

Brenda Jewett: So you're talking about next month?

Jeff Kositsky: Regularly. Moving forward.

Del Seymour: Well, let's take public comment on it. That should give everyone a chance to pipe in, because this affects everyone in this room.

Do we have any public comments on whether or not we should 30 minutes earlier?

I think this is where we're at right now.

Charles Pitts: Where we're at right now is are we adding to the agenda?

Ralph Payton: Right now we're just talking about whether or not we're going to change the meeting time in public comment? This is under number three, board announcements and scheduling.

Okay, so are you are you going to go by individual ones? Are you just only doing-- are you going to schedule it earlier? So where are we at in the-- it's sort of a point of order.

Ralph Payton: Right now we're just talking about scheduling it earlier.

Charles Pitts: Okay. So you're going to open up the floor again later? Okay. Let me ask my question again. So you're going to open up the floor, again, to public comment? Well, let me finish that. I'm in opposition to it.

David Elliot: If you start it 30 minutes earlier, it would allow me to come more often. That's all. I would appreciate that. Just one person. Thank you for your consideration.

Kelly. And I just wanted to say that if starting early means that you've have more time to discuss all the issues, thumbs up.

Brenda Jewett: I think the only problem that I would have is sometimes we have a really robust agenda, but often times we haven't. It's easy to conclude in two hours. And I don't want to just expand the pants to fit the meals.

James Loyce: My view is that if this is a one-time rescheduling, then that's fine by me. I don't think that we're going to make this a permanent solution of ours.

Ralph Payton: That's what they're recommending, a permanent move in time right now. Again, if this was a one time for next month's agenda.

Del Seymour: So my thing would be that eventually, that we could get to a matter where this board and this meeting is not concerned about who's coming next. Homelessness is the biggest issue in this city and we shouldn't have to be restrained by time. All the other boards and committees in this building, they meet five, six, seven hours, if necessary. And I don't want to be bound by this.

I was just at a national homeless conference last week in Washington. And everyone walked up to me and asked, "What the hell are you all doing out there?" And I couldn't answer. By in the middle of the week, I started telling people I was from Santa Barbara.

Something that we can't do in the two hours, we need three hours, maybe even four. This is the most important issue in this damn building. And we should be number one as far as, " I care about Tyrone and Shiela outside. And if we need to deal with Tyrone and Shiela in three hours, we need to deal with the three hours.

Ralph Payton: We'll just have to figure out where we get those three hours from.

Andrea Evans: But it sounded like one point that we needed to confirm is that Charles needs to make sure we have access to the room early enough to do that, to even make that an option. Is that correct?

Ralph Payton: Why don't we do this? Is Let's vote on all of those in favor of moving earlier. And then, now, we can have Charles check into viability the viability, of course. So all those in favor of moving to a 10:30 meeting?

Brenda Jewett: Can I just ask for clarification? I'm sorry. Are you saying 10:30 to 12:30 or--?

Ralph Payton: 10:30. All those in favor of the 10:30 starting time, say, "I."

Yes.

I.

I.

I.

All those opposed, say, "Nay." Nay.

I say, "Nay."

Andrea Evans: So I'm in favor, but I don't know if we can vote on it if it's not listed as an action item.

Ralph Payton: And then, once we have that information, we get the formal vote on moving the time.

Jeff Kositsky: Just as a point of order, what you're doing now is setting the agenda for the next meeting, and it is in your purview to change the time for the next meeting. If you want to add this as an agenda item to do it permanently, that would be another action item.

In that case, then I would change this. To move the meeting earlier next time, I would say, "I."

Ralph Payton: Not quite unanimous, I were the only, "nay." But at this point, it looks like the board is open to that suggestion, Charles. So if you can assess the viability and further up to next month, we can have it on the agenda moving earlier. Any more comments moving forward?

Public Comment:

Charles Pitts: Well, I want this body to address the standards of care in the navigation centers. It just seems like the navigation centers are a way for the city to cut the standards of care and the 90-day shelter extension policy. We're getting to a situation where the navigation centers are being unregulated, and we have no protections regarding what type of staff they hire. There are no regulations.

It's all unregulated. And the pictures on the internet are already showing standards of care violations. You're violating city and federal law by some violations. In addition, you're creating a situation where you're going to incubate disease by having the clients sleeping so close together, that it's a violation of the standards of care of the 18 inches apart from each other. In the picture shown, it was two strangers sleeping within like 6 inches. And if a client has a complaint, this shelter monitoring committee is actually being blocked from handling it. Some of the navigation centers are illegal by San Francisco administrative code 106. I don't know if any of you have read it, but several of the navigation centers are illegal just by that legal coding. And she's going to try to propose a navigation center that is twice the size legally committed. And I'd appreciate that y'all address at any of these meetings. The legalities.

Charles Pitts: Thank you, Charles. And I think with the suggestions that we have, either Jeff or somebody that knows these navigation centers come to this board in the future. I think those are all big questions, and I know we've talked about the standards of care in the navigation centers for it feels like more than a year, so some clarification would be great. Do we have any other public comment or should I move forward?

Public Comment: I was recently at a supportive housing. I was only there for a month before they didn't try to evict me. I was targeted because I made calls about the building. I wasn't hooked up with my

therapist session. I didn't get the support that I needed from the social worker. Then I was evicted. I tried to retrieve my things. I was jumped on. I got pictures to prove. I wasn't able to obtain my stuff for two months, which a Compass counselor helped me to get my things. And so when I started going through my stuff, all my stuff was looted. I have pictures of that, too. When I left, I left my bed intact and I had my jewelry and I had my daughter's computer in here.

When they went in she said that the maintenance man said that the door was left open. I was supposed to-- when I got up this morning to get evicted, I could have gone to court where I could have just went to a program and got hooked up with services. I was in and out of the hospital, which is how this person-- I have a long letter that you can read. If you need pictures, I can get them or they can be forwarded to y'all on y'all emails.

I couldn't get in contact with Jeff, but I had one delivered to Jeff's office Friday. It happens that there's no email for Jeff online, or his assistant, and a couple of other people that's in the city emailed for me. So we tried to-- so I just did it a little bit myself. Jeff was aware of my situation. I was told by Shelter Care Plus when they came, when I was trying to get my stay because I didn't get my mail for me to go to court, and they told me that, "I'm sorry, but you dropped the ball. You got to write us or we didn't come see about you." That's not fair to me. Right now, I got stabilized--

Ralph Payton: Unfortunately, your time is up, ma'am. Thank you so much for sharing your

Del Seymour: Oh, Jeff do you have someone from your department here that can speak with her?

Jeff Kositsky: Not at this moment, but we've received the-- information received.

David Elliot Lewis: I'm a former mental health work commissioner. I've been working with supervisor Haney in Ronen's office on advisory capacity for new mental health legislation called Mental Health San Francisco. It'll come to the ballot hopefully in the November election. I think it's something that your group should be informing on and should be aware of and advising on. So I'd like to propose that you invite those supervisors or representatives from their offices to talk about Mental Health San Francisco. It directly overlaps and intersects with your client population, and I think you should inform across it. The legislation. The terms and conditions. So that's it for your consideration. Thank you.

Del Seymour: Thank you, David. The last speaker, I'm going to make sure that we as a board follow up your concerns because that's why we're here.

Public Comment: Thank you. See my thing is I don't want that to happen to nobody else. I just don't want that to happen to nobody else. I feel that the housing should not be a social worker visit. The housing is being funded this way, and they're hiring the social I feel that it should be a professional doing it because I'm not the only one this has been happening to.

Ralph Payton: I agree. This is something that I'd like more information on. It looks like our July agenda's pretty packed but Charles, if you could reach out to the supervisors and then do a presentation on it.

Kelley Cutler: That would be something that might be interesting to include in our retreat.

Barbara McKinley: I'm not sure I'm addressing you in the correct point in time because this is my first time here. And I apologize for the sunglasses. My glasses are broken. I became homeless at the age of 48.

And then, I lived in Golden Gate Park for a year and a half. Then was at the Alder now for three and a half years after being at the navigation center-- the original navigation center for a few months. We were made a lot of promises at the navigation center.

Basically, keep your door closed, don't consort with anyone, and in a year you can do the moving up program. I've now been there three and a half years and there is no moving up in my future, it does not appear. Although I've applied with Bristol number of months ago.

We have a property manager now who seems to be evicting everyone because that's what she likes to do. And it has become a major issue. I was sexually assaulted by someone. They do not know what they're doing. I mentioned I got bitten by someone. That's what I said. They came into my room, unannounced, and told me I had to throw everything I owned out. Which is really tough when you've already lost everything you've owned. I did. I threw all my stuff out. Then they came in, there was not a bedbug to be found in my room. Just something needs to change.

And I've applied for the Bristol. I hope I get in there. We also have no elevator which has become a major problem. I've watched people crawling up the stairs.

Presentation of the letters of support for the California Emergency Solutions and Housing Funding from HSH.

Dillon Schneider: I'll be presenting my own self. And I actually just recently joined the HSH as the new manager of policy and legislative affairs. So I look forward to working with you all in the future. It's my pleasure to come before you today to request your support for HSH to apply for the California Emergency Solutions and Housing Program grant, also known as CESH.

CESH is offered through the California Department of Housing and Community development, with funding received from the Building Homes and Jobs act Trust Fund. SB2. Chapter 364. Statutes of 2017. We are excited to work with our state programs to utilize this valuable resource. So with the board's support, HSH will apply for-- I'm sorry, with your support in 2018, HSH applied for and received a \$1.6 million cash allocation. This allocation was used for services to support adults experiencing homelessness, who received permanent 811 vouchers for scattered sites or housing.

Eligible activities for cash funding include housing relocation and stabilization services that include rental assistance. Operating subspace for permanent housing, plus full housing subsidy funds. Operating support for emergency housing interventions. And systems support for homelessness services and housing delivery systems.

So as I mentioned, in 2018 with your support we received 1.6 million out of a total pool of 53 million. And in 2019 we anticipate San Francisco receiving about 900,000 out of the total pool of 27 million.

So as a breakdown for the 2018 cash funds, you can see that roughly of the 1.6 million, 81,569 was allocated as allowable grant administration, which left roughly 1.5 million for eligible activities.

So the 1.5 million designated to eligible activities was allocated to Brilliant Corners and the Episcopal Community Services to support their work on the implementation of 811 vouchers, including housing locator services to identify units in the private market and to provide ongoing stabilization services after

adults are housed. A further breakdown of the 2018 cash funds shows that 92%, or 1.5 million, were used for scattered-site-supporting housing services, and that served 150 individuals that were experiencing homelessness. 3%, or 49,000, was used for one systems support, and 5%, or 82,000, was used to cover administrative costs.

So with your support, HSH would like to submit a 2019 cash application that will be due on June 28th, 2019. HSH anticipates receiving an allocation of \$908,209. Roughly 45,000 of this would be allowable grant admin, leaving roughly 863,000 for funding eligible activities. 2019 funds will be used to continue the services added to Brilliant Corners and ECS contracts in 2018.

We've also been working with the mayor's office, who generously sponsored a resolution that allowed HSH to apply for cash funding as required by HCD guidelines. The resolution was introduced on May 22nd, and we anticipate it going in front of the Budget and Finance Committee in the coming weeks. I am happy to read that resolution directly today if the board would like that. Read it if necessary.

Grant read into the record and available on website:

So lastly, of the anticipated 2019 allocation, 95% or 863,000 will be used to serve an estimated 100 individuals experiencing homelessness, and 5% or 45,000 will be used to cover administrative costs.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration this morning. If members of the board approve HSH to apply for the 2019 CESH funding, we will move forward with the application process and request a signature from the board on the standard letter of support. Happy to take any questions.

Andrea Evans: The funding, I think you said, was directed, primarily, to Brilliant Corners and ECS, and I'm wondering if you can share a little bit more about, specifically, what the funding is intended to be used for and how you're arriving at the estimate 100 people will be served.

Dylan Schneider: So for the definition of 100 people, I will need to check back with our staff, but I'm happy to send you over that information. And then, in terms of Brilliant Corners and ECS, the information that I have right now is that funds in 2018, and I assume that they will be similar in 2019, were specifically used for unit acquisition, landlord liaison services, and stabilization services, and those were some of the items that we were under contract with both ECS and Brilliant Corners through this CESH funding.

Del Seymour: So this is only scattered site?

Dylan Schneider: This is only scattered site.

Kim Mai Cutler: I'm just curious for greater context in the state's role in Department of Homelessness within San Francisco. How does this relate to other state funding?

Dylan Schneider: That is something I am going to have to get back on you, because I am still learning that myself. But I do know that this is a sole source of funding just under CESH and that there are other opportunities that HSH is looking into, to apply for. And as you mentioned I believe Governor Newsom is looking to expand that pool as well, so we'll be watching that closely and looking for any opportunities we can.

Ralph Payton: Thank you Dylan. What we're going to do next is open this up to public comment.

Public Comment:

I want to know is the funding for 123 tenth street, because when I go there my granddaughter's going to be there. And a couple of people I've sent there, and they were told they got to come back in six months. So I don't see that-- if that's what that money for I don't feel that that's appropriate.

Thank you.

Megan Owens: I just want to clarify, future cash funds and all housing resources and homeless response system for adults, can be accessed at 123 Tenth Street, 2111 Jennings Street, and any future adult access points. Homeless adults should all proceed to an adult access point. Thank you.

Del Seymour: So this will be part of your problem-solving unit?

Megan Owens: Problem solving resources and access to the homeless response system:

Charles Pitts: I guess I'm looking for information to see if these programs that we're funding are even effective. Or if they're actually even follow the contract or city law?

Is there any documents regarding how they monitor these contracts to see if they're effective or not? Or do they follow their contract, or who actually monitors all of the contract? This is several questions, like you were implying. It's a hot mess. People are being suffered to deal with slum lord conditions. Bugs, and mildew, I mean it's-- is the city okay with funding those kind of. I shouldn't want to even leave the tent if they have to go deal with bed bugs in these housing stock. They could put your money in your pocket, just it's-- the shelter-resistant homeless, they've been through your systems, and they see that they're getting support, and it's no type of protections. I mean, when do we get some type of protections against this form of government. I mean, Jeff you see what he's doing now, just not paying attention.

Cathy and Rocky: We are here representing the main shore navigation center. We're thankful and grateful to be there because we have come together since May 1st, 2019. And since we've been there, our case managers has been working diligently with us each and every day, helping us move closer towards housing. And we are now closer towards housing than we ever, ever been, and we're truly thankful. And I think and believe that there should be more navigation centers open up like this one because the homeless crisis in San Francisco is out of control. And I think that if there were more navigation centers like this, then it would be better for the homeless people because it's really, really hard. It's really, really hard. We come from a mighty long way, and we are truly thankful for that navigation center. And we thank you for having us here just to speak on it. And thank you again.

Del Seymour: If we don't have any other public comment, then we'll open up to a motion for support for the agency's application for CESH funding.

I'll hold the motion.

Second.

All in favor?

Any opposed?

Letter of Support passed unanimously

Megan Owens: I'm the manager for coordinated entry at the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. I'm going to a PowerPoint today. I'm going to pass out copies to you all. There's yet another hand out at handout at the table for any members of the public who'd also like a paper copy.

Megan Owens: So, board members, I was asked to come today and answer some questions about our Family Coordinated Entry system and, especially, the shelter waitlist. Here in San Francisco, we now have the capacity to offer emergency shelter to every family who's experiencing homelessness in an unsheltered location, people who are sleeping outside and people who are sleeping in cars. The capacity that's most readily available is at First Friendship Shelter, located at 501 Steiner. The San Francisco Outreach Team and our family Access Points have been offering placement at that shelter to all unsheltered areas for several months now.

So folks who have seen this graphic before-- as you know in San Francisco, we have a myriad of excellent programs. So historically, families and other people experiencing homelessness had to navigate them in a pretty complex pattern, often having to have a variety of documents and other challenging administrative processes. The goal of coordinated entry in the homeless response system is to create a single, unified approach for folks to know how to access services-- to know what to expect.

The goal of problem-solving is to help people currently experiencing homelessness to find a safe, alternative place to stay. Often, our problem-solving resolutions for families are people reuniting with friends and family out of town. We've seen a slight increase in the number of families utilizing the Homeward Bound program, and many families used problem-solving for many years in creative ways to stay with friends and family to prevent an episode of homelessness. At our family access points, any family that's not resolved through problem-solving is given a priority status assessment. These priority status assessments determine the family's relative priority for housing, and they're separate from our shelter waitlist.

Our shelter waitlist in San Francisco for families is conducted at the family access points. There are currently over 200 families who are on the waitlist for a shelter. Those families are mostly staying in shelter. A significant number of those families are staying in a housing unit that they would like to leave in order to enter a shelter, and a small number of those families are staying in an unsheltered location.

We've come many times to discuss family-coordinated entry with you all, so you'll remember that our top priority for family shelter placement in the individual room shelter group, which is the place where there's that 200 family waitlist. It's families who are fleeing active domestic violence, physical or sexual violence in their home, who cannot be served in the domestic violence system - those families are fairly rare. So when an unsheltered family is seeking individual room shelter, they go into the next vacancy even when other families who are living in shelter or living in a housing unit have been waiting longer.

Folks know that, for families, we have all of our components of the homeless response system in the housing portfolio. So we are currently actively connecting families to rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and scattered site housing. We also have a Moving on Initiative (MOI) for families that have had a tremendous amount of success. As you all know, there are also various coordination

challenges and challenges getting these programs up. A variety of program providers and homeless response system staff are working together to improve our rapid re-housing response, our permanent supportive housing responsiveness, and the capacity of the Moving On initiative so that we can serve families with housing as rapidly as possible.

Currently, there are three access points serving families. Folks will remember we're now about a year in, almost, to the operation of the newest one at 3270 18th Street, also known as the Mission Access Point. Recently, there was a celebration of over a year at the Bayview Access Point hosted by Catholic Charities. Congratulations, Catholic Charities. And 37 Grove has replaced 995 Market as the Central City Access Point for families. Please also note that we've opened two new access points since the last time you saw this slide. Families can also access our mobile services. So sometimes families need to access the homeless response system at a drop-in center, at a school, at some other location.

Family service providers and advocates can call the mobile access point response. The number of families seen by our family access points has been relatively stable since launch. Over 1,500 families have been seen at the access point. This is just assessments over time. While household size for families varies wildly, our most common household size is two, and families, on average, are in households of three. We're very proud of the work that family access points have been doing with youth head of households. Our youth representativeness at our family access points looks appropriate compared to the point-in-time count and other data sources.

Family access points seem to be representative by both race and ethnicity. We have seen a decrease in the number of black households seen at the family access points compared to the connecting point waitlist several years ago and an increase in the number of black headed households.

We believe that this is representative of the currently homeless population and may represent an improvement in responsiveness to black households since we opened the Bayview Access Point. This is just a breakdown of where families were living in their most recent assessments. You'll see that it is most common for families to report that they are living in a place not meant for human habitation or living in shelter when they complete their assessments. Also, just the number of housing referrals-- again, we would love to see a real upshift in the number of families who are referring to housing out of the access points. Lots of folks are working on improving our rapid re-housing response and the flow through permanent supportive housing so we can house more folks.

Hybrid room shelters are also referred through our family access points. As you can see, there was a relatively low number of referrals made in March 13. A huge increase in the number of referrals made in April. That's interesting. We're going to do some more analysis on that. And then, as we started focusing on ending unsheltered family homelessness, we rolled out a new question in the in the ONE System which is when a family reported that they were unsheltered and the access points or the San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team offered them placement at the 501 Steiner or First Friendship Shelter. If the family declined to accept the shelter placement, we asked them why. We've been doing this for several months, and 45 families have let us know that they would not be going to First Friendship Shelter in that seven-month period.

The most common reason, overwhelmingly, over 20 respondents, said they did not want to sleep on mats on the floor. They would accept shelter only if there was a bed. A small number of families were offered

individual room shelter and congregate living shelter within a short period of time. Families prefer the individual room shelter. That's not surprising. Families also told us they wouldn't move into the congregate shelter because of lack of showers. There are showers provided at the shelter through Lava Mae, but they're not in the building. And they told us that the storage solution did not meet their family needs. So these are folks who reported that they were sleeping outside or sleeping in a car who also reported they did not prefer to leave their, mostly cars, in order to move into First Friendship Shelter, and there have been 45.

Kelley Cutler: I have a quick question about that. Is Lava Mae there every day?

Megan Owens: Good question. I do not believe they are. I'm not familiar with their schedule, but I do not believe there every day.

Tomorrow is our next public meeting about coordinated entry. It will be here in this building on this floor. There will be a really extensive focus on the demographics of families assessed and families placed. We hope folks with good ideas to improve family coordinated entry will engage in that process.

Jeff Kositsky: Could I just add-- one thing is, so folks know, we're currently negotiating with First Friendship to either keep it open 24/7 and be able to add showers and better bathrooms to the site or to relocate. So I don't have timing or written information on the specifics but that's our plan-- is to do that.

Brenda Jewett: I'm glad that's a mandate.

Del Seymour: There's a company that helps with that passed by daily on Park. They rent showers. It's like our Lava Maes. It's a company that has, I would say, 30 or 40. Could we think about could they get some showers? Shower vans since they have money and budget to do this? It's a big company.

Jeff Kositsky: I don't know the specifics. I think we're looking at all the possible options, including that, with the current owner of-- the location is owned by a church, First Friendship. And like I said, we're-- the difference between then and now, is we're renegotiating a lease with them, so this is sort of a requirement for us to continue with that site. If not, well, we have some other sites in mind.

Brenda Jewett: And how long are they waiting and when can they expect to be on the waitlist?

Megan Owens: I don't have an idea on the duration, but times are very closely related to family circumstance. So we recently ran the numbers, and families are waiting two days for an eligible rooms shelter offer if they were unsheltered. But families who were living in a safe housing unit, but who want to leave in order to access shelter, they would be waiting much longer. Because we're no longer using a first-come-first-serve methodology.

We're placing families based on their current status. So the families living outside and they go to an access point, that access point immediately tells them that there's vacancies every night at 501 Steiner. A lot of families go to 501 Steiner. Some families tell us they're not interested. We gather the reason that they're not interested so that we can improve our congregate response.

For families that are placed in an individual room shelter bed, we use information about the families recurring utilization of our system in the length of the time that they have been unsheltered, in order to prioritize them. So families who are sleeping outside right now, and families who are fleeing domestic

violence that cannot be served in the domestic violence system go first. Families who are living in a housing unit, let's say, with grandparents or other folks who want to leave that situation with no domestic violence, they're waiting a much longer time.

Brenda Jewett: And do you see an expansion of opportunities this year with the budget in San Francisco with those? Will there be additional housing created in the next 12 months?

Megan Owens: So currently, we have a substantial rapid rehousing response. And we see that some of our rapid rehousing providers are having a hard time using the dollars they've already been awarded. So we're all working together in order to help our rapid rehousing providers get folks houses. Whether those folks start on the streets, start in shelters, or one of those. Brilliant Corners is one of the partners, Compass, Catholic Charities, Hamilton, many of our providers who serve homeless families also operate rapid rehousing programs.

There are also two permanent supportive housing buildings for our families. Permanent and supportive housing is often what families are seeking in our system, so this is the time of relatively high placements in permanent supportive housing. Permanent supportive housing is clearly not going to be available for all families.

Andrea Evans: I just want to make sure and try to understand-- you said in the beginning that we now have the capacity to offer shelter for every family who wants it. So if all 200 of those families on the waitlist turn up, you'll be able to offer them a shelter?

Megan Owens: Great question. For all those families with from never having sought placement at 501 Steiner, to showing up at 501 Steiner today, that would be an overwhelming day for the folks offering assistance inside the shelter. What we will be focusing on is encouraging families who are otherwise sleeping in their car or sleeping outside in an unsheltered location, to go into 501 Steiner instead. Those the folks that SF homeless outreach team and the access points we're really focusing on.

Andrea Evans: And so do you have a sense of how many that-- the universe of that? What's that population? What is that?

Megan Owens: So our best guess on that population is people who tell us that they're in that situation. So last month, month of April, 13 families told us that they were unsheltered. That's the population that were repeating with that 501 Steiner offer too and the folks who will be top priority for placement in our individual room shelters.

Andrea Evans: But if all 13 of those families showed up, we do have capacity in our system to serve them?

Megan Owens: Absolutely. There are well over 26 vacancies in that shelter every night.

Andrea Evans: Just a couple of questions. I'm trying to see. I think it's slide number eight that has the housing referrals, next one after that? I can't quite tell what the color coding--

Megan Owens: Oh, I'm so sorry, it's months. So that's January, February, March.

Andrea Evans: Got it. So April is not there.

Megan Owens: April is not here. This is just very simple math. If you look at your monthly updates, you'll see the number of families referred versus the number of families houses. This is the number of housing-- families house as a graph. It did not go through our editing process this morning. I apologize. It'll be nicer next time you see it.

Andrea Evans: And then the reasons we've declined, is it safety? That's the reason? I didn't see that?

Megan Owens: Safety is one of the responses. We have not had any families say that in our system. So we're asking questions like, "Why are you not interested in staying at the 501 Stenier" Folks have options and access to showers and don't want to sleep on a mat on the floor. So far, none of the families have reported that safety is their concern. Families who are asking about safety a couple of ways, neighborhood staff, etc.

Del Seymour: So how do you ask them that? Do you give them a choice of and you have to check out that checkbox?

Megan Owens: Yeah, it's a database so it's pretty standard. There's something like 10 choices folks have and then other with notes. So far, families have overwhelmingly identified that they don't want to stay on a mat on the floor when they're asked that question.

Jeff Kositsky: A couple of other just things I want to point out is there's actually three congregated shelters that are available for folks. There's Hamilton, the fourth floor of the Hamilton shelter. There's also that one at Buena Vista and Horace Mann shelter program which is continuing into next year and First Friendship. And then we've got multiple single bed or single unit shelters in this system as well.

Jeff Kositsky: I also wanted to answer your question, Brenda. There are currently 473 additional family units being in the development pipeline. So new housing for families experiencing homelessness as well as an additional 27 for parenting transition age youth (TAY). So it's roughly 500 units in the pipeline. Just under 500 units.

Del Seymour: So those 26, I presume you're saying an average of 26 vacancies a night?

Megan Owens: The average numbers of vacancies at the First Friendship shelters are between 25 and 35 for several months.

Del Seymour: But is there any way to temporarily use those beds or those slots for youth, or--

Megan Owens: What HSH has been focusing on is making sure that families have the word out that that shelter has a lower capacity. Frankly, a year ago, two years ago, the shelter was full every night and families were sometimes diverted to the other Providence Shelter on Third Street. We believe that that reputation may still precede the program so we've been very focused with the homeless outreach team and with the family access points on educating families that they would be accommodated there tonight if they were interested.

Del Seymour: Would you be able to put single adults in there in or no?

Jeff Kositsky: It's a family shelter and I think it would be a difficult mix in the congregate setting. I think the other thing to remember is also we added 50 or 60 slots at Buena Vista Horace Mann-60. So we've doubled the capacity of what's available in the system.

Del Seymour: So that's your strategy and just put the word out?

Megan Owens: So what we'd love to do is invest more in housing and less in shelter, right. So as our housing system really operates rapidly it might be possible in future years to no longer have anyone waiting in shelter That's what we're all steering towards.

Andrea Evans: So that makes sense to me. But you also mentioned earlier that some of RRH are not spending that amount of money. So where is this disconnect between the goal to get people out of shelter and into housing and using the funds that are not being spent?

Jeff Kositsky: So we're in the process of renegotiating with the largest rapid rehousing provider which is Hamilton. Both increasing the budget in order to address the fact that rents are higher and that cost of living in San Francisco in the Bay Area is higher. And we're about to sort of sign an MOU with them at the end of June that will kind of get them hopefully back on track at a pace that we're comfortable with and that will next year dramatically increase the number of placements that we're able to make.

We're hoping to make an additional-- and I'm sorry if this may not-- I'm just estimating here 15 placements a month next year starting in the summer. And also I brought in organizations like Brilliant Corners who are very good at sourcing housing in the private market which has been an ongoing challenge. So we're adjusting based on current economic needs and are fairly confident that we'll be able to get back on track in terms of hitting our targets.

Andrea Evans: So it sounds like the funding there was an issue being able to obtain units with the money that they had there?

Jeff Kositsky I think it is more complex than that. There's been a challenge for some providers to obtain units. Not all providers have that struggle. There's been a problem being able to staff up adequately in a difficult labor market and just working on improving coordination between all of the providers. Again Alan wasn't able to join us today but he's been working really hard along with our director of housing with our providers around making corrections based on financial and other needs and also redistributing funds so that organizations that maybe don't have the capacity or aren't able to make the placements.

We're taking some of those funds and redistributing it to organizations that are willing and able to up their placements. So we are expecting an increase of 18 placements starting sometime in the middle of the summer.

Kelley Cutler: I was curious to ask about undocumented families?

Megan Owens: We appreciate everyone getting the wording out that undocumented families are welcome in all components of our homeless response systems. Similarly, all people who undocumented who are experiencing homelessness are welcome in the homeless response system.

As folks can imagine, especially in this political climate, people can often be nervous about trusting the system.

None of our providers can keep records of those immigration statuses, and we would never share any information with immigration as a result of participating in the ONE system. In our adult system, sometimes undocumented adults who are priority status in our navigation centers about five to ten days longer while they're waiting on housing placement because not all of our housing units can accommodate folks purely because of their federal funding. So we can work that out on the backend.

Sophia Isom. So what are you guys doing to reassure undocumented families that they won't face any possible deportation?

Megan Owens: That's a great question. One of our most common Q&A is that information about this is available on our website. All of our staff were very passionate about and answer a lot of questions about it in various community forums. If anyone has also have suggestions about how to get the word out. And most of our best suggestions come from the non-profits that we contract within community groups.

Mirabel There is currently, as Megan mentioned, 211 families. So when we talk about bed capacities we really have to take and pay attention to the difference between housing a family versus providing shelter to the individual. In that specific report, I do want to point out a couple of things that Megan didn't have information to, but I do.

You guys were asking about how long it takes for a particular family who actually go into a shelter. And if you look at the second to last column this is the number of days that families actually wait or they have waited. So they come into one of the access points and completed and assessments, that's how long they've waited.

So the second to last column, that's the number of days. And then the total number of verified time shelter is what Megan verified a shelter and the number of times that they were waiting.

And it's a little complicated because if a family is at an emergency shelter, for instance, Hamilton families, their time there gets counted a little bit differently than if they were out in the street. So there's a formula that's created with in the ONE system. And why time differs a little bit.

I also want to point out when we talk about capacity there is 65 beds available First Friendship and then another 20 at Providence. So that's 85 if those beds were available, let's say tomorrow, if you look at the verified at shelter, which is the fourth column, there's a total number of 25 families that actually have been verified by Bay View Access Point and Mission Access Point to be living in their car or a place not meant for human habitation. So that's in addition to the 13 that Megan pointed out. So just in this 25 here, if you look at the next column and you add all the numbers for the family composition, there's a total of 91 families. So as much as we would like to say, "Yes, we have room for every single verified, unsheltered family." We don't because as we mentioned, there's only 26 to 25 vacancies a night. So there's a total of 91 families from this list that I pulled out from the one system earlier actually on Friday that are still unsheltered. Whether they want to go into First Families or not, we just wouldn't have the capacity if they are to all sudden say, "Yes, I do want to go there tonight."

Ralph Payton: Are you saying, 91 families or 91 individuals and families?

Mirabel: 91 individuals. So 25 families that have been verified and that adds up to 91 individuals. Lastly, I want to show, if Charles can pass this around, please. This is just a little more context around the

families that are denying going to an emergency shelter. That was a beautiful pie chart. And yes that shows that most of the responses from the families are the fact there is no beds, there's only mats and just the shower situation.

However, in this particular report, which I know is something that we pulled from the one system and pull it from the families, we also ask the housing problem-solving specialist to ask a little bit more about the specifics of their reason. And in those reasons, you will see, and I think I showed this to you guys last time I was here, there's more to it than just, "I don't want to sleep on a mat." It's, "I have a three-year-old that can't sleep on a mat." Or, "I am pregnant and I cannot sleep on a mat." Or, "Yes, staff has been rude in the past, therefore, I don't want to go there." Or, "Yes, the neighborhood is a little funky I don't want to go there."

So I want to make sure that you guys have that data too because it's good to have that, but to put it into context of a human experience that the families are going through, the fact they are pregnant, the fact that they are disabled, that that's why they are turning down a mat, not because they have something better. So that's what I wanted to share with you guys today. Just a little more context, I think that we are all doing the best that we can about capacities in the department, the access points, and all of our providers.

We really appreciate all of your support, but like I mentioned before, we truly don't have enough and if one day all those families in that list that I just showed you were to show up and say, "We need shelter tonight," we would not have somewhere to put them. So I'm glad to hear from Jeff that he's working and his department are working on making the conditions of the shelters better, that they're working on providing more stability for those families. And yes, like Megan mentioned, the key is housing, but in the meantime, we have to have somewhere for these families, for these pregnant women, for these babies to go. So thank you so much. I will take any comments and/or questions from the board.

Del Seymour: So why is this report more specific to the reasons to refuse than the department's?

Oh, because I pulled it out straight from the ONE system. They have access to it.

Del Seymour: I'm just wondering why. Because Megan had said, was it two years ago, that the beds were actually utilized more? What's changed. Because there's got to be something for not utilizing those beds.

Ralph Payton: I think we're talking about the First Friendship ?

Mirabel: Well, I can only speak from the numbers that I have in front of me and also just what I hear and what I see on a day to day basis. And a lot of it is there's a lot of concern about families going into congregate shelter in general. And even rightfully so, they have concerns. But there is definitely a concern around going into First Friendship, whether that is true, made up, or something happened one time and it just got really out of control as far as what is said in the community.

People say either, "I've stayed there before and I don't want to go there again." or "I had a friend that stayed there before. He told me not to go there." or "I just simply don't want to go there because it's not in the neighborhood that I want to be in." or "I've heard things about it so I'd rather stay in my car." And it's saddening to hear that a family with young children would rather stay in their car than to enter a place that's supposed to be a safe haven. So there's a little bit of that.

Obviously, I think your question earlier-- when you have small children, you need a shower every day. That's a necessity. So if you don't provide that on daily basis, shouldn't a parent try to figure out other ways to do that and to provide for their family. That's only what I can share as far as what I hear. But it's very interesting that families are choosing to stay in their cars other than go to an emergency shelter setting.

Del Seymour: So that's kind of a reason why I brought that previous question up, because we hear what you hear and that is not reflected in here.

Mirabel: We started documenting every since, why families don't want to go into First Friendship months ago. So our process, with the access points because we are trained the same way, is we offer them the option. Some of them tell us right there and then, "No." and that's what we document. But a lot of them leave with the information and we don't know if they're going to go or not go and if they do go, great, but if they don't go, we don't know what answers is why there's only-- you see them as only 45 families that have refused, but in reality, we offer emergency shelter to a lot more families, it's just we haven't been able to capture whether they go or not because we have, as access points we do not have a way to see who actually shows up at First Friendship.

So we can't see the family that we talked to early. I see that they were on the fence, that they could or they could not. We don't have a way to see if they actually showed up. So those are just from folks that actually said to us, "We're not going and this is why."

Jeff Kositsky: I thank you as well. And I agree with everything that you said around the need for people to have showers and that's-- but I think it's also important to note that nothing has really changed at First Friendship. The numbers have just gone down and I would like to offer a different explanation because I think it's extremely important. Whereas there's obviously a ton of work to do and we are far, far from perfect, but I think it's also important to highlight where we've been successful.

So I wanted to point out-- and why I think the numbers have gone down or one explanation. In October first, 2011, there were 2,364 students who reported that they were homeless in December since the unified school district alone not including-- and, then, includes doubled up people living in SROs, etc.

On October first of 2018, that number was 1,607. A 33% reduction in the number of families on that day that were homeless. And we always use that date as the sort of benchmark. From 2011 and 2019, added 30 more individual unit shelter beds as well as 60 additional congregate shelter beds. So increased our capacity in the shelter system fairly significantly.

And as a result, for those of us who have been doing this work for a while, remember back 2010 and 2011, the family shelter waiting list was above 300 on a regular basis. And now it's down to about a third. So I don't believe that it's a coincidence that we've seen a 33% drop in both of those metrics over a protractive period of time. That's not enough. It needs to be a 100% reduction. No child should ever be in this situation. But we also, during that period - I don't have these numbers in my head - in addition to adding a lot of rapid rehousing, we also opened a significant number of permanent support and housing units for families. Almost every affordable housing development that opens up for families is 30%. 20 to 30 percent of those units are set aside for families who are experiencing homelessness.

So while we do have a lot of work to do, I mean-- also, these numbers indicate that we're making progress. And what we know works is adding more housing, adding more rapid rehousing, making sure there's enough shelter capacity in the system. And I think we need to stay on track and recognized that when we do make these investments, we do see success. And when we stop making these investments, we start to see increases in homelessness going up. And I'm hoping that the decline between 2017 and 2019 was really paltry and pretty much stayed flat. And I think I'm glad that we got some new investments coming up in family housing in the 2019 to 2021 budget.

Andrea Evans: I think they're about 30 people who indicated that they were pregnant on the list. What is the prioritization for those families in particular?

Mirabel: So yes. So there is none as you can see. So this list also the way that we utilize it in the central city access points and of the other access points. We will be placing the families at the top of the list first unless another family shows up that has an active DV or there's some sort of medical emergency. So the next time families to go into the individual shelter rooms will be the ones at the top. So if there is a pregnant mommy or a family with a really, really young child, those number 85, they will have to wait their turn to be for the shelter. There is a very limited number of PATH that are specifically safe for pregnant moms and newly born babies. Those are all completed in capacity at this point.

Oftentimes, there's the hard news that we have to deliver at the access points to pregnant moms because, remember, a recording and entry coming in on board. The new redesign of how we do business, a pregnancy does not necessarily be a priority. We need to assessment at the beginning. All information is captured. But all of these-- all of the families get placed into individual room shelter is based on the length of homelessness and nothing else.

Brenda Jewett: Remember that we had a discussion about the dedicated rooms for pregnant women. How many are there?

I think there are about 12. 12.

I hope there is something. Is there something that could be done, Jeff?

Jeff Kositsky: So tomorrow just to that question, your question, tomorrow before the board of supervisors they'll be hearing-- we're asking for authorization to enter into a lease with the Bay View Point Community Foundation to open up Jelani House as a program for women or people who are homeless and pregnant. They'll be 17 slots and then including 24 if you include spaces for children but hopefully, we'll get folks housed before their child comes. So we are expanding that program assuming that the board approves this tomorrow.

Ralph Payton: So there have been a lot of good news for sure. I don't know. We've definitely improved. As Jeff's noted, some numbers have gone down definitely but some things haven't improved as much as we like we would like. But prioritizing newborn child, a mom with difficult pregnancy, it'd be great if we could find some way to implement that sort of prioritization.

I agree with you 110%, Ralph. And there are times where if it's a difficult pregnancy, we also have a couple of medical hotel rooms. We have a very difficult job of going to kind of make those really hard

decisions because for every woman that is pregnant, there's 24 more of them are and there's no way of us - we have not been given the, I guess, the flexibility to prioritize in that sense.

Mirabel: I think that we have had some very fruitful conversations with Leslie and also with Megan and others about this particular situation, this particular issue because we have to take care of our babies. They're the future of the city. If a child is born into homelessness, their chances of having a fruitful childhood and adulthood are a lot of harder. So I agree with you. I have heard about this project and I'm really excited to kind of see where it goes. But at this point in time, this is kind of the reality that we face on a daily basis at our center and those are the kind of hard conversations we have to have with families on a daily basis.

Sophia Isom: So are you guys tracking what happens to the pregnant woman who aren't fortunate enough to get in some type of housing and how many may end up having a referral or something made against them and they end up in our system which is child protective services? Homelessness is not a main reason why. I know there's other contributing factors but I'd like to know if you guys have the ability to track that and see if there's any correlation of what's happening?

Mirabel: So I know that we can track a trajectory of the family if the family comes in again and if the family all of a sudden becomes a single adult and enters to adult services system. But I don't think within the system we have the ability to know of pull reports in that sense.

Jeff Kositsky: HSH has the ability to access public health data so that we are able to see what's happening with families who are-- we don't obviously necessarily know where everybody is at any given moment but we can track them through our system as well as through the public health system and work really closely with Dr. Deb Born and others at the public health department who are working on this issue which is definitely a growing problem of people who are pregnant and experiencing homelessness. But HSH does and partners with DPH.

Erik Brown: This has been a long time conversation. It's gone on and on Gillani House might be opening up. This will solve some of the problems but this has been talked about forever and a day. So we need to figure out how to advocate for this process. I'd ask the question point and at that point there was nothing else. And even then, there was only so many medical beds

And First Friendship, I commend them for the work they've been doing over the years. . But ideally some other emergency building or facility for families would open.--over the last nine years and some of those issues are still occurring. It's great that they have periodic shower service there now. But I mean, I don't know how many have been to First Friendship when they have families there. But it's a pretty chaotic environment and it's hard to think about bringing your family there with small kids and then getting them ready the next day to take them to school. Again, it's a necessary resource.

Jeff Kositsky: Buena Vista is another congregate shelter that families have access to that's not at capacity that does have showers and I think is in a-- it's not Providence's fault the physical condition of the building that they're in. But Buena Vista, it's a nicer location I think and again, I think, unfortunately-- and I hope that we don't suffer any further delays but Jelani House was supposed to open over a year ago.

But there's good reasons why it-- well, there's some good reasons and some challenging reasons as to why it's been delayed. The reality of it is we discovered-- even though that program had run for many years,

when we got in there we found that there were some hazardous condition that needed to be corrected. We don't want to move children into a place where there's any kind of hazardous materials and it's taken time to figure out how we're going to mitigate those and then negotiate the lease. But again, if we get approval tomorrow, we'll be able to move ahead very quickly on this and if it's not enough and it sounds like based on the numbers it may not be enough, we'll need to revisit this. I don't think anybody at HSH or anybody period I would hope thinks that it's okay for somebody who is pregnant to be on the streets and not have a safe place to be when they have another person on board or people on board that need care as well.

Public Comment:

First of all, it's so disappointing to see that Charles and Jeff aren't seated at dulling pianos. So, Del, you touched on this. And if I missed this one I was out in the bathroom. Please forgive me. When the survey given out was the enumerated list of 10 choices with 11 being other, or was it an open-ended question so that you'd actually find out what people wanted to say? Because if you just give them an enumerated list that's a terrible way of actually finding out what's on people's mind.

Megan Owens: And you can see exactly how he asked the question. There's a multiple choice question. I presented a pie graph of the responses. And then there's also the at notes field about staff and staff at the family access points and the Bayview admission and notes about why the family declined.

Unfortunately, some of the handouts that she made distributed had unique identifiers. This is a common error because it's not easy to figure out who folks are. But that often feels safe to share. Unfortunately, it would be HIPPA violation if you walked out of the room with those today. So we'll get you an appropriate copy without the identifiers.

Martha Ryan: I just wanted to first of all thank all of you questions. Thank you for your reports. Fantastic. And I also want to thank you, Eric, for pointing out how we have had these conversations before. We have waited a year and a half for this lease to get signed for Jelani House because there are hazards and probably not be until the middle of November before it gets opened and that will be the earliest time. But it is so important to go upstream because if we don't and those babies become homelessness and poverty they just don't have a chance. And they would end up on the street.

So it's truly important for us to do. And I just want to give you a little clarifying information on the Path rooms. Two years ago, we had four rooms. That clearly was not enough. And thank you, Jeff. We got another four rooms added. And then most recently we actually advocated and worked with both HSA and HSH CalWorks. Calworks wants to work with us to try and pregnant moms and women with young children, especially pregnant moms, coming off of Calworks and having to find jobs and are homeless, a place to stay. So we advocated for four more rooms. HSA Calworks is paying for those four rooms. So that's 12. It's a great space. It'd be great to have 16...

Public Comment:

Hailey Wright and San Francisco Health Plan. I provided this piece of feedback at the last family meeting that I wanted to just share with the whole board. And we're curious in learning more about the criteria used for the prioritization for families. We learnt that prioritization is only factored in the of the head of

the household and not of the children or other members of the family. And we're just curious to kind of join that conversation. We really believe that it's important to factor in the needs of children as well as we consider vulnerability and look forward to discussing that either here as a full group or at the family meetings.

Malia Chavez: And I wanted to just highlight the continued need around the prioritization for those doing DV. So we have recently been tracking some clients who are seeking assistance as they're exiting a permanent long term shelter. And as part of that then we're sort of the support problem solving is happening at the CE entry points. We're getting a lot of referral back to HVP in which case we will then offer a hotel room because they're not able to access that the access points. So I know that with some of the access points we've had wonderful conversations. I know that they are working on some possible changes but really highlighting that because just as recent as last week people are exiting the DV shelters with nowhere to go opting to sleep in their cars with their children because they had no other option other than First Friendship and did not want to stay on mats on the floor or be in a congregate environment just after fleeing a DV situation. I'm not sure whether or not hotel rooms are part of the problem solving budget, or what the parameters are around that, but it would be really great to be able to access that.

Ralph Payton: Great. Thank you so much. I have to say really quickly, we haven't talked about DV Shelter system, which has been at capacity for years. So, Charles, I wouldn't mind getting an update around that. We'll figure out exactly why that is. I'd loved to hear about-- I know they've been asking for this funding for years. I know family shelters have had to turn down people that are victims of DV without having a shelter placement ready to go for them.

Amy Farah Weiss, the founder and director of the Saint Francis Homelessness Challenge, and we started doing this work in 2015, and our focus is on ending the crisis conditions of street homelessness, but creating safe, organized spaces to belong on that path to healing and housing, and addressing those essential services.

And so in 2016 and 2017, we actually had some transitional shelters we called them at the time at encampments. And a couple that was a pregnant couple with their two dogs stayed in one of our shelters, and then we actually supported the coordination with homeless prenatal for a couple of folks that were out at this other encampment called Box City. And so there was some coordination because whenever I would become privy to it, people would talk about it when I would come out to the site, they need to get those connections, and it was a step. So it's creating that additional step. And what's nice about those transitional shelters which are now referred to as emergency sleeping cabins in state code, or emergency shelter response, they are locking. And so you could actually extend-- I don't the site that this shelter you're talking about is at, but you could have four or five emergency sleeping cabins on site potentially, and I do a lot of research on components for emergency shelter response, specifically right now shower and locking trailer, so you can—

And so the key is that what we could do, and Doug, you were alluding to this earlier, but there are places you can lease or you can borrow, like from the AIDS/LifeCycle maybe even, but you can order a shower and laundry trailer for \$76,000 that has five washer and dryers and three showers and it takes one to two months lead time, and so if we had a few hundred thousand dollars we could do a few of those, right off the bat. So, something to discuss. Thanks,

Del Seymour: Amy, thank you, and thank you for all the work that you do under those freeways and behind the bushes for folks.

Public Comment: I want to congratulate because Jeff here, because I had a hard time a couple of years ago when I was going through my surgeries. I had two surgeries. I had one at six months and then I had a hernia at nother six months, and there wasn't no system for me to get to through the system. And before this support housing thing happened, I was accessed to the system, and through my medical problems, and it was a good thing that I was able to be in here, because I was hospitalized three times while I was at kind of this other family shelter, where your bed was your room.

And I would like the access point at compass because they helped me to even through my tribulations going through this report on the housing, they have stood right here with me through thick and thin, and even when I needed to gain access to therapy, but I couldn't make it to the two hour trip into the Avenue, they made sure I was hooked up over at South and Market. So I'm grateful for that access that they give out now for families.

Charles Pitts: Lavame has locations one day a week, wouldn't Surplus Poverty have some cots? What happened to those beds that were at the 16th Street at the Navigation Center?

Shelter Shock and run-around report, remember? And in your quartely reports from the Local Homeless Coordinating Board. They say most of the complaints are regarding staff. They don't talk about the conditions. So why are those numbers missing in this lady's report? I'm also wondering about this school that was converted into the shelters for families. So how does that come into play? How did that parallel? I guess I'm just wondering what's going on with these statistics as to they don't even mention to the staffing, as to what they're doing. I really wonder what it would be like, and I'm also wondering is the Shelter Monitoring Committee actually monitoring of Friendship House and what's their stats and statistics regarding that? Are they being treated within the standards of care? I don't know if they've learned the standards of care, at this point.

Ralph Payton: All right, so the agenda item that we had skipped over earlier is agenda number five. At last month's meeting, we had two letters that we wanted to vote on for approval.

Del Seymour: I'll good with the language of these letters. So what my suggestion will be, the letter supporting the mayor and navigation centers should be sent to the mayor and the board of supervisors. The letter regarding the HSOC should be sent to the HSOC center. Who's there, I don't know. I don't really know. I mean, it's hard to figure out who is running that place. And I know Sam Dodge and Commander Lazar, and there's a third person. We should send our letters to them. We also should send a letter to Mrs. Carroll, who's the director of the Department of Emergency Management. And that's the folks I would suggest we send them to.

Jeff Kositsky: So there's many more departments involved. At this point, it's close to a dozen departments. If you provide the letter to me, I can include it in the packet for the-- we have a meeting every other Thursday. I can just put it in the agenda. That way, every department head will get it. If I tell you the list now, I'm going to forget some, but I can make sure it goes out to the full group. I could copy you guys on the email when it goes out. So when I get the agenda, I'll reply to all, copy you all, and I will attach the letter to it. And that way, every department head who's engaged in this will get it.

Kelley Cutler: I have an issue with the one that is HSOC only has five of the ten questions. And what we spoke about at the last meeting is that they were going to be cleared up with the five answers to those five questions. And then, I'm assuming that Commander Lazar would be coming back with the other five questions. And so-- yeah. Because now this is a letter with only half the questions, and

Jeff Kositsky: I have an answer to some of them, but what we had committed to doing and-- we made a plan, like five hours for the July meeting. But I committed to bringing answers back by June 30th, so that would be the July meeting. I've got some of those answers now, but I also just want to point out that there were a few other issues that came up, when I read the minutes or that have been going on in discussions, that I didn't see in the letter. One was the request that there be an HSOC community advisory board. It's kind of been a constant drumbeat and came up in the minutes. The other was that an LHCB member be allowed or be appointed to represent the LHCB at the policy meetings that happen every other Thursday. Well, then there was just general requests that you all had that department heads come to these meetings, but we didn't really necessarily narrow that down, but I pull all those questions apart, and actually some of them were-- I came up with 14 questions. Some of them had multiple questions. I sent all of you an email kind of laying those out, and I'm prepared to answer some of them when you're ready but need more time to get complete answers to-- and I have not yet presented this to Commander Lazar or the other eight HSOC members. I was waiting for you all to make your decision today what the letter was going to look like.

Kelley Cutler: Kelley asks if HSOC had a draft of the letter.

Charles Minor: The letter was posted and sent out because of the Sunshine Ordinance so anyone could have gotten a copy.

Jeff Kositsky: I don't know who said that to you. There's been no official discussion of this. Maybe individuals have given your comments back, but there has not been a big discussion at that group about the letter. I was waiting for you guys to send it, and then we'll make sure it gets on the agenda. There's not a meeting--

Kelley Cutler: So if that's the case, then, actually, the context of the initial draft letter-- it would make sense to keep that in because, basically, what we edited down to has taken out the context and supporting information.

Ralph Payton: I guess certain individuals might find fault with the language used in context. So, number 1, we had two letters that we want to vote on. So we can do votes, and if the votes for a HSOC letter-- people are supporting that. Say they want a longer time.

Kelley Cutler: There are major concerns because of human rights violations taking place. That's not okay. It's just not. And that has been happening with the local homeless coordinating board because one of the things that seriously is with the increase in criminalization so it is really relevant here. And so I think that we need to be going through this real and honest.

Jeff Kositsky: Want to just reiterate what you said that the-- and where the local homeless coordinating board's role does make sense here in that one of the questions that is asked in the continuum of care application is related to criminalization. So it is certainly relevant. And it might be worth adding that to the letter. Just to remind folks just if people want to know why. There is a very clear reason why. Which

is that it is something that is measured in terms of our ability to get federal funding. So and then the other thing that I just wanted to-- and I don't know about time consideration is that if you wanted to, we could sort of walk through each one of the questions. And if there is just general agreement on the board on each one of those questions, those could be included in the letter. And I think I did take some time to kind of make them neutral in how they were presented. And also again, include some other things that you all have brought up to put this in context.

Ralph Payton: So let's start with the process of first of all this before we move to vote on it.

Del Seymour: I just got one question. I'm asking you again. This is a standalone issue you were wanting. I'm good with the letter. Let's do this thing today. But then you have to tell me about our request they have a representative at the bi-weekly meeting. So can that be done separately?

Jeff Kositsky: Can we send a second letter? Yeah. I mean that's a good point. We could always send a second letter. Or you could request the opportunity to come and just present, one of you to come and present directly at a future meeting. And then go through all the questions in more detail. Including some of the ones that have not been written in the letter, certainly a possibility. I can't promise that that will happen. But I will tell you I will certainly advocate for that to happen.

Kelley Cutler: So we were supposed to have a tour. But there's been a lot of promises for a while now. And really with the five questions that are on here, I don't even think we should be voting on this letter. Because it's only the five that are in here were mostly addressed to you, not to the rest of HSOC.

Bryan Edwards: So you guys have the authority. I mean you get less points for increased criminalization which is exactly what's happened in this city. They've treated you with such disrespect this year. They've treated you guys like you don't matter and you do matter. You do matter. You are the continuum of care oversight board and this is right in your lane. Please bring back the language that establishes the context for this. Bring back all the questions. And the second letter? The second letter is such Santa Barbara bullshit to sort of coin what you said. This is the second letter, accommodation letter from the mayor. It clearly came from her office. But this letter wants you to endorse a model that doesn't exist. It's an abbreviation. This letter wants you to commend a bold initiative. That bold initiative was back in October. Stop wasting time on bullshit letters like the second one.

Martha Ryan: You have the power of the purse over the grants that are on the application that you send into the federal government with your names on that application. By the way, I'm going to very strongly suggest that you consider setting a specific dedicated hearing to hear from the staff and from your contractors about what exactly you're being asked to put your names on with that application.

And you could decide what you're putting your names on. And one of the things that you're being asked to put your names on is about reduction of criminalization that you can either get points or not get points. And that does mean that you are the oversight board about how the funding whose application you supervise gets spent. You are an oversight board. You have authority. You can set hearings on this. You can direct your staff to set hearings on this with a motion and with a second and with a vote that directs the staff to schedule hearings on these matters. And I do not know whether you have subpoena power but you certainly have authority to decide whether or not you will be granting people the right to make

ungodly human rights violation uses of continuum of care funding. That you have the power of purse so please consider scheduling hearings on this. Please consider directing heads of agencies to that.

Jeff Kositsky: Just a clarification. I appreciate all of the speakers but just a clarification that no federal money is being used for any program that touch HSOC of outreach, no shelter, no navigation centers. But that being said as both of the speakers pointed out there's still a question in the application related to criminalization. And it does impact our ability to-- so just wanted to clarify that.

Del Seymour: Local Homeless Coordinating Board not being a chartered commission we limited in our ability to govern or oversee these other departments. And that's why some citizens and even some government members right now are proposing a commission to have that power.

Charles Pitts: I still believe that you could call for a hearing regardless if you have power over HSOC or not. I guess my question is why are you going to approve a navigation system that the controller said was racist in its report? Why are you going to endorse a navigation center system that is violating third-party contract law?

They are violating several San Francisco administrative code laws. And basically, they are going to gut all of the protections and the homeless have had and fought for over the past 10, maybe 15 years going from 7-day stays to 90-day stays with extensions. Jeff guts all of that. I mean I think the thing that you should remember Bevan Duffy's navigation centers were successful.

Because people were able to get housing. And Jeff's navigation centers, he navigates people to the streets or out of town. 15% success rate is nothing we should be funding. Nothing at all. I mean that money should be put in the San Francisco HOT team stabilization rooms. It could be in other places. But the navigation center as Jeff has been running, they're a failure. 15%, 15%. I mean any other organization except for this one. Any other organization 15% rate the CEO's head will be on the chopping block.

Jeff Kositsky: I would like to respond to that since it was directed at me. And you can also read the controller's report. That will explain to Mr. Pitt and to anybody else who cares to look that the first navigation center was only successful because the entire permanent supportive housing portfolio was redirected towards that navigation center. Which is violation of all best practices around addressing homelessness. Making somebody's eligibility for housing tied to where they happen to be sheltered that night doesn't respect the fact that we have a limited amount of housing. And we need to prioritize it as best as we possibly can. And of course, as we open up more navigation centers, of course, the success rate is going to go down. Because the bottom line is we also have to open up more housing exits to folks.

Navigation centers are not magic. Maybe they were billed that way by people who came before me. But they are not magic. They don't magically produce housing. They don't create additional exits for people. They can't solve the housing crisis that our state is facing. So but what they do provide is an excellent respite for people off of the streets. They do provide people an opportunity to address health and various other challenges that they're facing. But of course, their successes in terms of exits are limited by the challenging housing market that we're currently operating in.

So I just want to be clear what we did. What HSH did, and not me but the entire department, is to realign navigation centers towards national best practices around using coordinated entry as a way to decide who

gets housing, as opposed to a random system based on who's the best at getting in what line. Now it's based on who has been homeless the longest and who has the highest needs.

Public Comment:

I'm very confused what the local homeless coordinating board role is if you don't really have authority? You should over the services that the city is paying for for homelessness. So I don't really understand what your role is. And if you don't have authority, why would you have another layer on top of the commission? Why not utilize this? Become the commission? It sometimes feels like the more layers there are of people reviewing things, the more complicated it is and the less things can really be done in an efficient way.

Jeff Kositsky: I think it's important that the public understand what the local board's actual role is. The local board is a federally required-- in most other communities it's called the Continuum of Care Board. It's a federally required body that we have to have in place in order to receive funding from the federal government. We receive about \$45 million a year. A little bit less than that. In federal funding, the local board sets the scoring tool that decides-- all the applications we get are based on a scoring tool, set by the local board.

They set prioritization standards and any other policies around just that federal funding. At this point, I would say at least 90% of that money is going towards permanent supportive housing and other types of housing. It's not really spent on shelter or services or employment programs anymore. It's really primarily focused on housing. However, again, the local board also has control over the application that we submit, and as I've mentioned numerous times, one of the questions in the application is around criminalization. So it's certainly within the local board's purview to have questions about that.

Public Comment: Just from the short time that I've spent in these local homeless coordinating board meetings, it seems like you're dealing with all the issues of homelessness, not just whatever the federal government wants you to meet regarding-- it just seems like I cannot imagine another layer of people coming in, and they're the commissioners and you're the board. The coordinating board. Well, coordinate then. Coordinate homelessness.

Erik Brown: For a point of reference, when this department started to have a HSH, there was a commission and there was a coordinating board underneath it. So if it comes up again, I assume that they would abolish this board?

Ralph Payton: So again, these are conversations for next month where we'll get more more into this. Back to the letters. So we have two letters to vote on. Let's start with the mayor's letter around the safe navigation center.

Brenda Jewett: Can I ask who proposed that on the report? Or was it a consensus that we sent this, the letter to the mayor?

Ralph Payton: Yes. Last month we talked about it. All in favor of supporting the mayor's letter around the safe navigation center say, "I." All opposed. Any abstain?

Kelley Cutler: I'm abstaining.

So we will send the HSOC letter to the mayor. It's just a little more complicated.

Andrea Evans: I'm so sorry. Were the other five questions left out intentionally? Or was that just an oversight? I don't remember what the five are that were taken out right now. But it's a little hard for me to decide whether it's this letter or the previous one that I would rather support

Charles Minor: Last month when we were discussing this. Jeff had mentioned that he would take the first five and work on bringing them back to you. I was working on the assumption that we would present five bring them back and then the remainder. As to Kelley proposal to get the room, I don't think that it is unreasonable.

Ralph Payton; So then we have a vote on the letter. He supports sending the letter as is?

Ralph Payton Was that three yays and four nays?

Ralph Payton: four opposed.

Raph Payton: Any abstaining?

Sophia Isom: I think I'll abstain. Because I think additional questions need to be-- I'm just a little concerned that there is a certain number of questions that aren't included

Ralph Payton: Jeff took the responsibility of getting those answers for us which might be a more direct path to getting answers But as of now, we have four nays and three yays, correct? So then we won't send the letter as is. And Jeff and Charles. So let's see if we can maybe schedule a meeting in the next couple of weeks so that any of the can be invited to the meeting so we can discuss this in more detail. Our last agenda item is just public comment. So do we have just general comment?

Courtney McDonald: I'm a legislative agent for the District Six office with supervisor Matt Haney. And I was just going to mention that our Homelessness Oversight Commission proposal will be discussed at a later date. So I don't want to take up too much time, except just to introduce myself. Let you all know that we look forward to working with all of the members of this board to really strengthen your role, and figure out how we can incorporate a new commission to really help the department meet its goals. So that's all I have to say for now. I look forward to speaking with each of you and will be reaching out to set up some meetings.

General Public Comment:

Regarding the Sunshine Ordinance and the quality of retention, I believe it's section 67.7.9.14C and point 29-2 regarding the very severe non-compliance of the committee's website with Sunshine Ordinance. And particularly there does not seem to be a recording or a transcript placed online. Agendas and minutes both seem to be very close to the next meeting. And it's very difficult to discover who is on the committees and what they do and when they last met and when their next meetings will be. What their agendas are. What their minutes are. So I really very strongly urge you to direct your staff to also fix the broken links on the website. There are three on the landing page. So if you could be willing to direct your staff to update the website and place it into compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance that would be wonderful. Thank you.

Public Comment: I just want to make sure that it's clear to you in this body that you're involved, and your history throughout the 10 years of dealing with this you have always stood against homeless who have been victimized by service providers. You have never stood up for us. You have never deemed anything out of your way to protect us. If y'all have a complaint regarding abuse in these shelters, y'all did not even take it. You wouldn't forward it. You wouldn't do nothing. So at this point, you're pretty much like an enemy of the homeless because you will not help us be safe from the people that y'all give money to.

I mean, at this point you are an enemy of the homeless because you do not respect us. I mean you call the police on an elderly neighbor who was describing a contract violation. You just don't care. It just seems like you're more exploitative of the homeless than actually doing anything of substance. I mean, it's just very disgusting. Totally inappropriate that you would endorse a racist navigation center, as described by the city controller on page 18 and 19.

All right. Thank you all for coming here. This meeting's adjourned. We'll see you next month.